

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Chris Whitpan [cwhitpan@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:34 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chris Whitpan (cwhitpan@verizon.net) writes:

By letting the telcos double charge (once for my bandwidth and also websites) you are limiting free enterprise and will seriously hinder the entrepreneurial nature of the internet. It will simply keep innovation and private speech harder to reach which is what the internet is all about. I think it is a short term solution to a problem that could stifle the internet long beyond your reign, and I hope you would consider others who have to live with this decision, as it will only make the digital divide greater but now on the other side of the firewall as well.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 72.81.107.85
Remote IP address: 72.81.107.85

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Chris Wright [cq91k402@sneakemail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 6:41 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chris Wright (cq91k402@sneakemail.com) writes:

Hello,

Please keep some of these things in mind when considering whether or not to allow a tiered internet. The large telcos and ISPs that have a large percentage of the customers are ALREADY getting a significant income from those customers.

These companies would have you believe that they are not earning any money by transmitting/receiving information that is going to companies like Google, Yahoo, MSN, AOL, etc. This could not be further from the truth.

If ATT has 10 million subscribers paying an average of \$50 a month, they are taking in ~ \$500 million a month.

It is completely ridiculous for these companies to charge their customers for internet access, and then also be able to charge companies who send them data.

This double dipping concept should be illegal and does not make any sense.

If this is allowed to happen, how long will it be before telemarketers will be allowed to pay to "annoy". And why not charge both people on either side of a long distance call the "toll" fees.

Thanks for your time.

-Chris

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.170.17.95
Remote IP address: 69.170.17.95

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Cole Smith [md-geist@excite.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:47 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Cole Smith (md-geist@excite.com) writes:

With respect to opening up a "tiered Internet", you have effectively allowed the Telcos to double-dip their profits. This is analogous to a destination business being charged by a toll road authority for every customer that uses the road to reach the business.

Shame on you, sir.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 162.39.73.105
Remote IP address: 162.39.73.105

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Court Myers [cadmnky@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 3:10 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Court Myers (cadmnky@gmail.com) writes:

Mr. Martin

I really don't know what you are thinking when you think that a "tiered" internet would be good fo the public. I already pay for bandwidth and google already pays for bandwidth. Why does the ISP need to charge again for bandwidth? This could stifle small business. What protections would they have? The INTERNET is not an american only system you know. PLEASE think of us and not your pocket books.

Court

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.247.157.70
Remote IP address: 70.247.157.70

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: craig nubanks [cinomrah@tampabay.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:55 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

craig nubanks (cinomrah@tampabay.rr.com) writes:

I hope are paid well under the table from (X)ILEC for your recent decision to let AT&T charge (**WHATEVER THEY WANT**) for people/companies that already PAID FOR the hardware. Charging twice for the same service is OBVIOUSLY wrong, but you can't see that, because you're blinded by whatever \$\$\$ is thrown at you. From the bottom of my little heart, i hope a greedy, bought-off, waste of carbon like you gets what you deserve. have a nice day.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 169.153.28.25
Remote IP address: 169.153.28.25

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Craig Patterson [midigod@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:28 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Craig Patterson (midigod@aol.com) writes:

Chairman Martin:

I hope you will reconsider your position on allowing the telcos to limit bandwidth. The customers in question, such as Google and microsoft, have already paid for that bandwidth. Rather than being an impetus for competition or free trade, this really is just an extortion scheme designed to get high-volume users to pay even more money.

The notion of a Tiered Internet will not only stifle competition and free trade, it will also have a chilling effect on the web presence of companies not able to afford the "high volume" tier, thus creating an inequity that the World Wide Web was designed specifically to avoid.

I urge you to reconsider.

Sincerely,
Craig Patterson

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.201.62.90
Remote IP address: 65.201.62.90

SandraLyn Bailey

From: D Wegley [captainmac@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:23 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

D Wegley (captainmac@hotmail.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Tiered Internet

It is truly a sad day when freedom dies on the internet at the hands of an appointed leader. Yes, Mr. Martin, you are the man that is trying to kill innovation and freedom on the net. I read today that in a speech you are in favor and support telcos "double-dipping" on the internet. According to the reports, you said that you are in favor of telcos charging for the upstream and downstream for larger companies. What are you thinking? The internet is a place where everyone, large and small, has a level playing field. Now you come along and have the audacity to say that the telcos should be allowed to charge for internet or throttle their bandwidth? How could you even remotely support this? Small businesses that are starting out may not be able to afford this "fee" from the telcos when the larger ones can. Please explain how this could be a good thing for the internet. We in American have some of the slowest internet connections around and we pay the most for it. Now you are going to say that they can charge more. Companies will be charged by the telcos but who will foot the bill? The consumer. They companies will raise the prices of products to make up for the loss in income because of the telcos new "fees." I don't think the telcos are hurting for money with all of the acquisitions lately. I truly believe that you need to rethink your position before you are single handedly know as the destroyer of freedom on the internet.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.124.63.34
Remote IP address: 65.124.63.34

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Dan Mullendore [dmullendore@indy.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2006 8:39 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dan Mullendore (dmullendore@indy.rr.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,
I have to disagree with you when you think that ISPs should be able to charge content providers for bandwidth. As an end user, I am already paying my ISP for they bandwidth they provide. I am sure that the content providers are paying good money for the bandwidth on thier end. This may work to kill innovation and the stiffl start-ups. This will allow ISPs to double dip.

Thanks.

Dan Mullendore
1420 N. Alabama St.
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317-261-8736

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.29.79.226
Remote IP address: 65.29.79.226

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Dana Puschell [ddpcare@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 25, 2006 6:59 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dana Puschell (ddpcare@gmail.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,

Normally I don't allow myself to get upset about what our government does as it is a waste of time. However, I find that I can't sit still and say nothing about the recent concessions made to the companies that control our communications networks. These companies have been allowed to raise the rates for all their customers contingent on the promise of updating the US network. Yet, there has been no updating, in fact over the last five years my experience has been less service for double the cost. We are falling behind the rest of the world in internet speeds and our bills keep going up. I think it is time to ask the companies to make good on the promises of the past before we open the "cookie jar" again. This was probably a waste of time but I felt someone should point out how unfair this is to the citizens of the United States. We keep hearing that "the government works for us". How can we believe that if "big money" and "big companies win everytime?"

A Concerned Citizen,

Dana Puschell

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 71.102.244.120
Remote IP address: 71.102.244.120

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Daniel A Joyce [daniel.a.joyce@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:15 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Daniel A Joyce (daniel.a.joyce@gmail.com) writes:

Tiered internet pricing is a DUMB idea. It strikes at the heart of net neutrality. What are new services supposed to do, pay the extortion fee, or never get bandwidth?

Google already pays for their bandwidth, I already PAY for my bandwidth. I shouldn't have to pay premium to get 'reliable' service to visit Google's website. Google shouldn't have to pay mafia-style extortion to ensure their packets reach me.

"Hey Google, Ya wouldn't want anything to happen to those packets, kapeesh? So you might want to buy some 'insurance', understand?"

This is the most HORRIBLE idea ever, and shows the Feds are selling out to the ISPs like they sold out to the MPAA/RIAA on the DMCA.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.16.104.104
Remote IP address: 24.16.104.104

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Daniel C. Nelson [dnelson6@niu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 5:13 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Daniel C. Nelson (dnelson6@niu.edu) writes:

Your recent statements supporting the telcos to double dip on the bandwidth charges for Google, Yahoo and other major webservices have me very worried. This in essence takes away the neutrality of the internet at the very source. Any startup company that may have similiar goals to google could be swamped with all sorts of bonus costs from the ISPs that they in most cases won't have a choice to use. Honestly I don't understand why the ISP's have this mentality since if google and all the other websites I visit all dry up due to overwhelming double dipping costs then there's no reason for me to have the internet anymore.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 131.156.15.41
Remote IP address: 131.156.15.41

Sandra Lyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Daniel Collins [fccmartin@hometoast.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:46 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Daniel Collins (fccmartin@hometoast.com) writes:

regarding: http://www.networkingpipeline.com/blog/archives/2006/03/fcc_chief_att_c.html

Allowing ISPs to implement pay-to-play schemes, in my opinion sir, would be the end of anything good about the internet. It was the openness of the network that allowed it to grow where it is today.

The quality of service "priority" routing fees that Whitacre wishes to impose on large online entities is flagrantly double-dipping. *I* pay for my data transfer to and from my ISP. I don't work for Google, but I can be sure THEY are paying THEIR ISP for data transfer. Whitacre wants to charge a THIRD time; and it's nothing but corporate greed. I IMPLORE you to not allow ISP to destroy the network that has made this country great.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 199.173.225.24
Remote IP address: 199.173.225.24

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Daniel L. Brown [DBrownAOL@Hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:46 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Daniel L. Brown (DBrownAOL@Hotmail.com) writes:

I am dismayed that you believe that this is anything other than a model for extortion.
http://www.networkingpipeline.com/blog/archives/2006/03/fcc_chief_att_c.html

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 207.188.217.182
Remote IP address: 207.188.217.182

Sandra Lyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Daniel Roop [daniel.roop@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:18 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Daniel Roop (daniel.roop@yahoo.com) writes:

Chairman Martin,

I would like to take a moment to express to your my dissappointment in reading the news that you will possibly be providing legislation to allow the large telco companies to tier pricing for internet bandwidth. I will say that I do believe in allowing companies to make there own policy as far as pricing, and products they sell. However I believe in the case of the telcos, they are too close to a monopoly to allow this. I live in Orlando, FL and I am fortunate enough to have a variety of companies to choose from for internet service. However this is not the case everywhere. I understand that it takes alot to setup services like they offer, but to earn a monopoly for doing it, I think is unfair. People are very attached to the internet at this point, and American is behind as far as speeds, and avaialability goes compared to other nations. So for the telcos to take another step like this, just to gain an extra buck, when they didn't even deliver what they promised in bandwidth and availability I think is ridiculous and horrific. Chairman I trust you will listen to the people on this, and look out for our best intersest. I will leave you with a link to a technology news site that I follow, so you can see what other people are saying..http://digg.com/technology/FCC_Chief:_AT_T_Can_Limit_Net_Bandwidth.

-Daniel Roop

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.115.136.98
Remote IP address: 65.115.136.98

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Dave Mellert [gendo.ikari@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:01 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dave Mellert (gendo.ikari@gmail.com) writes:

A two-tiered internet would just be bad for America. Have you really thought about the consequences of this? I know we all love capitalism around here, but sometimes things just don't work very well under a purely capitalist model (like the distribution of certain commodities). So if you are going to regulate, why don't you at least regulate in a way that's good for the whole country, rather than just the big telecoms. They will still make money under the current business model, I promise. If they want to build a whole new internet from the ground up, without using any publicly funded research, let them charge anything they want. In the meantime, show a little backbone and keep the internet easily accessible to everyone, please. And certainly don't punish the American companies of the future (Google, Yahoo, etc.)

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 128.12.141.60
Remote IP address: 128.12.141.60

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Dave Seeger [dave@crazydave.cjb.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:59 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dave Seeger (dave@crazydave.cjb.net) writes:

Mr. Martin

I dont see how you can endorse a tiered internet platform. The companies that use the bandwidth pay for the bandwidth to the companies that built the bandwidth. The companies that use the bandwidth should not be charged for their connection, AND for the bandwidth they use, that is double dipping and should be frowned upon. I am very disappointed that you support a tiered internet. Why not force these companies to bring fiber to the homes like they should have when the government gave them hundreds of billions of dollars to do so a decade ago. Why not actually enforce something that makes sense, instead of stating that telcos can charge "whatever they want" to companies who use bandwidth. I dont see how a tiered internet platform is going to make any sense. You are basically stating that the companies who have installed and are currently running the software and hardware that runs the internet, now infact control the internet and can limit bandwidth to anyone they want, unless they pay large fees. Ridiculous! I strongly urge you to reconsider.

Dave Seeger

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 128.163.156.195
Remote IP address: 128.163.156.195

Sandralyn Bailey

From: David [Pienta@www.fcc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:13 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

David (Pienta) writes:

I recently came across an article that quoted you as favoring telecommunication companies (AT&T) that want to limit bandwidth unless websites pay higher fees. That is in no way a fair practice. This prevents smaller companies (such as myself) from competing with larger firms. This will stop innovation on the net as we know it. Since I pay a company for hosting my sites, I pay them for bandwidth for hosting. If I pay bandwidth at that point, why should I have to pay for it to other ISPs like AT&T? As a customer of high speed Internet (Comcast), I pay a fee every month for up to a certain bandwidth. Why should i have to pay any other fees for bandwidth? Do you have any idea what you are talkign about? Do you have an Information Technology degree? Making comments such as the ones posted tell me that you do not have a clue about the storm you are going to create! Let the Internet be, it is not broken, everyone is happy. The last thing people or companies need now is extra fees beyond what we are paying. The fees for gas, taxes, etc, are so high now that people are having a hard time paying. Wake up!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 199.73.167.8
Remote IP address: 199.73.167.8

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: David Anderson [davidanderson352@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:22 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

David Anderson (davidanderson352@att.net) writes:

A tiered internet is a horrible idea. Don't let it happen.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.23.221.227
Remote IP address: 70.23.221.227

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: David Brown [dbrown@risd.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:47 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

David Brown (dbrown@risd.edu) writes:

The concept that a telco could be permitted to charge a premium to sites using more bandwidth than they deem appropriate is stupidity at its finest. Another ridiculous opinion from the FCC. Not much of a surprise after listening to you clowns look for ways to censor private satellite radio providers.

Remind me please. Are you still working for the citizens of this country or have you completely sold yourself to corporate interests.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 198.7.247.203
Remote IP address: 198.7.247.203

SandraLyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: David Regan [regand@alum.rpi.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:27 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

David Regan (regand@alum.rpi.edu) writes:

Mr. Martin,
 I am writing to you to voice my concern over your support for the proposed "tiered internet." The decision to charge websites for the bandwidth usage they generate has many implications that I don't believe are getting adequate consideration. First of all, I pay \$54 dollars a month for my 1.5M high speed internet access. I paid for this monthly allotment and consider it mine to do with as I please. Whether I choose to use this bandwidth for streaming media off of msn, watching video blogs, reading foxnews.com or searching Google should be completely up to my own discretion. I don't want to end up having a connection to a site that is slower than what I pay for because that site didn't double pay my provider for use of MY bandwidth. I want to make clear that when a provider sells me, and their other customer's, bandwidth (which they advertise as being of a certain speed) that bandwidth is not theirs to sell again to those websites that I choose to access.

This proposal will also seriously stifle innovation on the internet. In the current system, the only thing needed for innovation is a good idea and some technological know-how. Access to the internet and web-hosting is currently inexpensive. Lot's of extremely innovative sites have had their origins this way (craigslist, ebay, google, del.icio.us, digg.com, wikipedia, the list is endless). However, in a tiered internet model, the only ideas that will be allowed to grow and catch on are the ones that will have enough financial backing from corporations to afford bandwidth. It would be highly anti-American to let corporations decide which innovations succeed and fail rather than the people who would use those innovations.

A tiered internet also will affect freedom of information. In the current system, for example, people have equal access to a small grassroots charity organization as they have to a larger, more robust charity with lots of financial backing. This is the way it should be and is constitutional. Under a tiered internet the large charity will be able to pay for more exposure and easier access to its site and ideologies than the smaller one. The implication on the political front is the same. The access to a politician's or candidate's information on the internet should not be related to how much that person is able to spend on bandwidth. The current political system is already too corrupted by money and special interest contributions, as we are seeing with all of the current indictments. This sort of financial censorship of the internet should not be considered, especially in an age when America stands so firmly against the ideological censorship of the internet (like that which is currently going on in China).

These concerns should be of great importance for anyone serving the public in a governmental position and careful consideration should be given to the repercussions of this proposal. I consider free speech to be a very important, inalienable right and the Internet is one of the few places left that honors that right in a neutral way. A change to a system where ideas are heard more (because they are more accessible) with the more money that is paid, would clearly not be a change for the better. I would urge you to stand up for the interests of the American people rather than the corporate interests of the telecommunications industry. Thank you for your time.

David Regan

 Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
 Remote host: 137.201.242.130
 Remote IP address: 137.201.242.130

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: David Rosenthal [Drozen20@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:29 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

David Rosenthal (Drozen20@gmail.com) writes:

Dear Chairman Keven J. Martin.

I just want to be another voice out there that says the way FCC regulates the airwaves involving the internet is found to be disallowed by the people representing the united states. I am one such voice I hope you hear others.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.214.119.16
Remote IP address: 68.214.119.16

SandraLyn Bailey

From: David Roth [munkyxtc@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:27 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

David Roth (munkyxtc@gmail.com) writes:

RE: Extortion fees for bandwidth preference. I sure hope that the big telcos are giving you money hand over fist to say such stupid things. This will result in double charges and pay to play structures. It's going to hurt everyone. The internet is the last frontier that hasn't been completely screwed up by the FCC, please stop.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 12.104.41.120
Remote IP address: 12.104.41.120

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: DJ Burgie [dajoker@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:11 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

DJ Burgie (dajoker@gmail.com) writes:

Regarding the "tiered internet" ideas proposed by Telcos, how does this benefit average consumers? How does this help small businesses who cannot pay the extortion fees? What good does it do for ANYBODY except the Telcos who are just upset because their technology was so popular in the previous millennium? Are you doing your job by doing what is best for the public, or are you being taken to dinner by AT&T, Verison, and the like? When the innovation on the Internet declines, free services like search engines disappear, and what is the world's possibly greatest achievement becomes sick from this disease, will you be able to enjoy your spoils then?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 130.128.0.2
Remote IP address: 130.128.0.2

Sandra Lyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Dominick Glowacki [dominick.glowacki@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:06 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dominick Glowacki (dominick.glowacki@gmail.com) writes:

I would like to let Chairman Martin know that the idea of a "fragmented and teired" internet is a horrible idea and will not help the internet continue to grow as it should.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.121.36.73
Remote IP address: 69.121.36.73

Sandralyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: Dustin Wish [dwish@indco.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:53 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dustin Wish (dwish@indco.net) writes:

I had believed you were a smart leader for the FCC. I am a systems engineer for a med-sized MSO in Arkansas. I have reviewed your statements on the "tiered" internet and believe you to totally wrong. So wrong I that it makes me wonder if you even understand the internet business! Customers pay the telecos for access to internet based content already. To add a "double dipping" tax to internet content is going to drive even farther the hate of telecos and a mass exodus from their networks. SBC, now AT&T hold a monopoly over us in Arkanas as no one else has fiber in our parts. I think you fail to see that most of the country is like that. A slave to a teleco at some point. We are going to start to mirror servers for companies like google or MSN in our NOC's to keep from going through the telecos because of the extra costs! I believe you are failing to see the model of hyper-distrobution at work. If you allow this "tiered" internet to develop then you crazy than I thought Powell ever was.

Dustin Wish
System Engineer/Programmer
INDCO Networks

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.139.178.9
Remote IP address: 66.139.178.9